# **EXHIBIT 99**

#### Message

From: Google Docs [comments-noreply@docs.google.com]

Sent: 1/27/2020 2:09:15 PM
To: rorymcclelland@google.com

**Subject**: Chrome / Sin Rastro - One Pager (draft)

# Sabine Borsay and Ramin Halavati added comments to the following document

Chrome / Sin Rastro - One Pager (draft)

New

5 comments

## Comments

despite considerable effort



Sabine Borsay

This hasn't launched though yet. To me "despite" sounds like we're failing despite considerable effort, but our effort isn't even live yet in reality.



Ramin Halavati

### New

+1.

I think we have not done that much effort. While I am not optimist about the possibility of proper general user education, I think we have not tried enough.

ReplyOpen



AbdelKarim Mardini

Is it worth mentioning that this promise *currently* doesn't even hold for 1st party apps like Maps where they have a statement upon turning on Incognito mode saying something along the lines of: "Turning on incognito mode does not affect how your activity is saved or used by voice search and other Google services".



Rory McClelland

Yes, I struggled with the complexity of introducing how the products inherently differ anyway (within a one-pager format, at least). Let me think how I can phrase it.



Rory McClelland

I've added an additional footnote to explain. Wdyt?



Sabine Borsay

## New

We should keep in mind though that every Marketing statement the team explored is not possible as long as we don't block sign in, also not the one in this doc. And while we do want to leverage a Google Account sign in as a **key** 

CONFIDENTIAL GOOG-BRWN-00701189

# 

**moment** to eventually guide users in multi-profile for identity segmentation, there are still privacy-motivated use case (like a secret account) that we would break if we'd ever block sign in. But if more privacy from Google is an opt-in, we could block sign in that mode.

On a side note, I'd bring this aspect back to the one-pager, since it was quite an important one in the context of the toggle. Because it could be one possible way to defend the decision why the toggle is off by default (because it breaks significant use cases like sign in); and at the same time, it has the potential to make the SR Incognito story so much stronger since once opted in (and sign in is blocked), we could make much stronger statements.

ReplyOpen

Advantages
------------



ReplyOpen

default off privacy feature



ReplyOpen

'internet'



### Ramin Halavati

### New

Also:

Google will not keep server-side logs of user activities in incognito and [if Google turns evil] the risk of linkage of these logs with signed-in logs would be reduced.

## Sabine Borsay

#### New

We could mention somewhere that right now, most users use Incognito mode for other use cases than pure privacy use cases (e.g. identity segmentation, only fresh cookie slate) and that if we'd degrade the Google user experience by default in Chrome's Incognito mode right now, we'd not do those users a favor and upset them. Therefore, we would **first** need to move users with those other use cases into other features like multi-profile instead.

## Sabine Borsay

#### New

We should keep in mind that the value and public statements that we would be able to make with more privacy towards Google are in practice not that strong. We also asked ourselves if the Internet would be a better place if Chrome would tell Google (or all

CONFIDENTIAL GOOG-BRWN-00701190

# Case 4:20-cv-03664-YGR Document 928-102 Filed 04/19/23 Page 4 of 5

sites) that a user went Incognito - and our conclusion was 'no'.



Ramin Halavati

#### New

I am not sure my answer is 'no' since I think the Google part of the internet can become a better place with this feature. Currently we are logging all user activities in incognito mode server-side, and that is more or less linkable to users signed-in data. So dropping that would be a big gain.

ReplyOpen

Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

You have received this email because you are a participant in the updated discussion threads. Change what Google Docs sends you. You cannot reply to this email.



CONFIDENTIAL GOOG-BRWN-00701191

PRODBEG: GOOG-BRWN-00701189

PRODBEGATT:

PRODEND: GOOG-BRWN-00701191

PRODENDATT:
PRODVOL: PROD042
2nd\_CROSS\_BEGBATES:
2nd\_CROSS\_ENDBATES:
AllCustodians: Rory McClelland
TO: rorymcclelland@google.com

FROM: google docs <comments-noreply@docs.google.com>

CC: BCC:

**CONFIDENTIALITY: Confidential** 

CROSS ALLCUSTODIANS: Rory McClelland

CROSS ATTACHMENTNAME:

CROSS BEGATTACH:

CROSS\_BEGBATES: GOOG-CABR-05260829

CROSS CC:

CROSS\_CONFIDENTIALITY: CONFIDENTIAL CROSS\_CUSTODIAN: Rory McClelland

CROSS\_DATECREATED:
CROSS\_DATEMOD: 01/27/2020
CROSS\_DATERECEIVED:
CROSS\_DATESENT: 01/27/2020

CROSS DE-DUPED CUSTODIANS: Rory McClelland

CROSS\_ENDATTACH:

CROSS\_ENDBATES: GOOG-CABR-05260831

CROSS\_FILEEXTENSION: eml

CROSS FILENAME:

CROSS\_FROM: google docs <comments-noreply@docs.google.com> CROSS MD5 HASH: 914134770AD05369279863705FCC7AC7

CROSS\_MESSAGE ID: <zBgjlVX\_uLpHeG1Q1hfS6g.0@notifications.google.com>

CROSS\_OWNER: comments-noreply CROSS\_PRODVAL: CROSS-PROD041

CROSS REDACTED: N

CROSS\_SUBJECT: Chrome / Sin Rastro - One Pager (draft) CROSS\_TITLE: Chrome / Sin Rastro - One Pager (draft)

CROSS\_TO: rorymcclelland@google.com CUSTODIAN/SOURCE: Rory McClelland

DATECREATED:

DATELASTMOD: 01/27/2020

DATERCVD:

DATESENT: 01/27/2020 DeDupedCustodians:

DOCEXT: FILENAME:

ILS\_ProdDate: 10/05/2021

CROSS\_ILS\_ProdDate: 11/16/2021

MD5 HASH: 914134770AD05369279863705FCC7AC7

MessageID: NATIVEFILE:

Owner: comments-noreply

PAGES:

REDACTED: N

SUBJECT: Chrome / Sin Rastro - One Pager (draft)